BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-5, 6, 75, 77, and 78 are rejected in the Office Action for statutory double patenting over claims 1-5, 7, 56, 61 and 63 of US Patent Number 6,218,118 (the '118 patent), and claims 74, 79, and 80 are rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over claims 61, 64, and 65 of the same patent. Claims 7-14 and 76 are acknowledged as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant appreciates the recognition that claims 7-14 and 76 are patentable, and respectfully challenges the rejections of the remaining claims. Specifically, Applicant points out that each of the pending claims recites a composition comprising *tagged* precursors. That is, pending claims 1 and 2 (the only independent claims) each include the language "wherein the mixture or set of sub-mixtures further comprises a set of tags wherein each tag is covalently linked to at least one X-mer precursor through a cleavable linker. Nowhere do the claims of the '118 patent teach or suggest such tagged precursors.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections for double-patenting, whether statutory or obviousness-type, over the claims of the '118 patent should be withdrawn.

Please charge any fees that may be associated with this matter, or credit any overpayments, to our Deposit Account No.03-1721.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/6/2004

Brenda Herschbach Jarrell, Ph.D.

Registered No. 39,223

PATENT DEPARTMENT Choate, Hall & Stewart 53 State Street Boston, MA 02109

Telephone: 617-248-5000 Facsimile: 617-248-4000 email: bjarrell@choate.com

Page 8 of 8

Atty Ref No.: 2003309(AGIL)-0013 Client Ref. No.: 10992153-1